

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/042,612	01/09/2002	Matthew I. Egbe	5669	7021
759	03/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Martin Connaughton Ashland Inc.			KORNAKOV, MICHAIL	
P.O. Box 2219	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Columbus, OH	43216		1746	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	-00
Office Action Summary		10/042,612	EGBE ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Michael Kornakov	1746	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS C	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thi eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	17 February 2004.		
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allo	owance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the meri	ts is
	closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-5,13 and 14 is/are pending in the	ne application.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	ndrawn from consideration.		
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5, 13 and 14</u> is/are rejected.			
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	1		
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.		
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		• • •	` '
11)[_]	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-15	2.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for formula All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have beer ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	3
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachmer	nt(s)			
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SEer No(s)/Mail Date		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 17, 2004 has been entered.
- 2. Applicants amended claim 1 to introduce the limitation of water soluble organic solvent range of 30-90 wt.% versus 80-90 wt%, as appeared in the previously allowed claims. Applicants submitted that previous amendment setting forth the range of 80-90 wt.% was "an obvious typographical error". However, the reasons for allowance clearly indicates that it is the amendment to the range that distinguished the present claims from the prior art, and that the range as appeared in the amended claims was the major reason for allowance. New claims 13 and 14 are added. Claims 6 and 7 are cancelled. Claims 8-12 stand withdrawn from consideration, as being drawn to non-elected invention.
- 3. Claims 1-5 and 13, 14 are examined on the merits.
- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office actions.

Page 2

Art Unit: 1746

5. Claims 1-5, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by or in the alternative as obvious over Inoue et al (U.S. 6,232,283).

Inoue teaches a liquid detergent composition comprising 30% of monoethanolamine (col.3, lines 35, 60-65 and col.10, line 62), strait chain alkylbenzene sulfonic acid with C8-C22 carbons (reads on dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid) in the amount of 1-30% (col.12, line 60, col.2, line 42, col.10, lines 60-65), and at least 40% of water (col.10, lines 63-65, and Tables 1 and 2). This reads on the limitations of claims 1, 3 and 4. With regard to claims 2, 5 and 13, 14 Inoue teaches the presence of malonic acid (col.3, line 45), which can be introduced in the amount of 0.01-30% (col. 1, line 61). Malonic acid of Inoue acts as a corrosion inhibitor, since it is the compound used by Applicants as corrosion inhibitor. Therefore, the composition as claimed can be envisaged by one of an ordinary skill in the art.

In the event that one of the ordinary skill in the art would not immediately envisage Applicants' instantly claimed composition, then the composition is rendered obvious from the disclosure found in the prior art reference to Inoue. The prior art contains each of Applicants' instantly claimed ingredients and clearly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they be used in combination as claimed. Such a suggestion renders obvious Applicants' instantly claimed composition, and as such, the claims are not patentable.

6. Claims 1-5, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jones (U.S. 4,199,483).

Art Unit: 1746

Jones discloses a detergent cleaning composition (abstract), comprising from 20-75%, preferably 30-60% of water soluble detergent surfactant (col.2, lines 5-10), which is preferably monoethanolamine (col.6, lines 35-40). This is component (A) of the instant claim 1 and further a component identified in the instant claim 2. Another component of Jones is a salt of an alkylbenzene sulfonic acid, wherein the alkyl group contains C9-C15 (col.5, lines 60-65). This reads on dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid. The composition of Jones contains 1-75% of water (col.7, lines 40-45).

The mixture of alkanolamine and alkali metal salt of alkylbenzene sulfonic acid is a preferred surfactant system in Jones (col.6, lines 32-37). This mixture is utilized in the amount of 20-75% of the composition. Such teaching allows to those skilled in the art clearly envisage the claimed components in the ranges as instantly claimed. With regard to claims 13 and 14 Jones utilizes corrosion inhibitor in the amounts of 1-3% by weight (col.6, lines 50-55). With specific regard to claim 5, Jones utilizes benzotriazole in his corrosion inhibiting composition (col.9, line 30). Therefore, the composition of the instant claims is anticipated by Jones.

In the event that one of the ordinary skill in the art would not immediately envisage Applicants' instantly claimed composition, then the composition is rendered obvious from the disclosure found in the prior art reference to Jones. The Jones Patent contains each of Applicants' instantly claimed ingredients and clearly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they be used in combination as claimed. Such a suggestion renders obvious Applicants' instantly claimed composition, and as such, the claims are not patentable.

Art Unit: 1746

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 02/17/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Relative to Jones reference ('483 Patent): Applicants arguments reside in contention that the examples of Jones show 30.2 wt.% of an alkylbenzene sulfonic acid, and the amount of alcohol and alkanolamine of 9.5%. Applicants further state that such ranges are outside Applicants claimed ranges. In response to this Applicants attention is drawn to a generic teaching of Jones who provides for 20-75% of combined detergent surfactant (col.2, lines 5 and 6), wherein the preferable composition of such detergent surfactant is a mixture of mono-di or triethanolamine with alkali metal salt of benzene sulfonic acid (col.6, lines 30-40). Applicants are advised that disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or non-preferred embodiments, consult *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including non-preferred embodiments, consult Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). See also Celeritas Technologies Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp., 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47 USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir.1998).

Relative to Inoue ('283 patent): The crux of Applicant's arguments is that Inoue does not disclose all of the required elements of Applicants claimed invention that fall within

Art Unit: 1746

the same weight percentage ranges. This is not found persuasive, since Inoue teaches a liquid detergent composition comprising 30% of monoethanolamine (col.3, lines 35 and 60-65 and col.10, line 62), strait chain alkylbenzne sulfonic acid with C8-C22 carbons (reads on dodecylbenzene sulfonic acid) in the amount of 0.01-30% (col.1, lines 55-60, col.2, line 36, and 42, col.12, line 60, col.10, lines 60-65), and at least 40% of water (col.10, lines 63-65, and Tables 1 and 2), which is identical to the instantly claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Kornakov whose telephone number is (571) 272-1303. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1746

Michael Kornakov Examiner Page 7

Art Unit 1746

M. COPNAKON 3/19/04